United States Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C. 20460

# Water Compliance Inspection Report

## Section A: National Data System Coding (i.e., PCS)

| Transaction Code | NPDES | yr/mo/day | Inspection Type | Inspector | Fac Type |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 N | WA0000482 | 10 0 3 3 0 | = | R | 3 |

4-8-2010

Remarks

21 ... 66

| Inspection Work Days | Facility Self-Monitoring Evaluation Rating | BI | QA | Reserved |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 67 ... 69 | 70 | 71 | 72 | 73 ... 74 ... 75 ... 80 |

## Section B: Facility Data

| Name and Location of Facility Inspected *(For industrial users discharging to POTW, also include POTW name and NPDES permit number)* | Entry Time/Date | Permit Effective Date |
|---|---|---|
| Countryside Dairy, LLC<br>771 Parklyn Way<br>Ferndale, WA 98248 | 3/30/10 1:35 pm | Unpermitted |
| | Exit Time/Date | Permit Expiration Date |
| | 3/30/10 2:34 pm | Unpermitted |

| Name(s) of On-Site Representative(s)/Title(s)/Phone and Fax Number(s) | Other Facility Data *(e.g., SIC NAICS, and other descriptive information)* |
|---|---|
| Micheal Schoneveld (Owner and Operator)<br>(b) (6) (Mobile)<br>(b) (6) (Facility) | SIC = 0241<br>Unpermitted |
| Name, Address of Responsible Official/Title/Phone and Fax Number<br>Same as above<br>771 Parklyn Way<br>Ferndale, WA 98248 | Contacted<br>☑ Yes ☐ No |

## Section C: Areas Evaluated During Inspection *(Check only those areas evaluated)*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☑ Permit | ☐ Self-Monitoring Program | ☐ Pretreatment | ☐ MS4 |
| ☑ **Records/Reports** | ☐ Compliance Schedules | ☐ Pollution Prevention | |
| ☑ Facility Site Review | ☐ Laboratory | ☐ Storm Water | |
| ☑ Effluent/Receiving Waters | ☐ Operations & Maintenance | ☐ Combined Sewer Overflow | |
| ☐ Flow Measurement | ☐ Sludge Handling/Disposal | ☐ Sanitary Sewer Overflow | |

RECEIVED
APR - 8 2010
U.S. EPA REGION 10
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT

## Section D: Summary of Findings/Comments

*(Attach additional sheets of narrative and checklists, including Single Event Violation codes, as necessary)*

| SEV Codes | SEV Description |
|---|---|
| | |

See attached report

| Name(s) and Signature(s) of Inspector(s) | Agency/Office/Phone and Fax Numbers | Date |
|---|---|---|
| Sandra Brozusky | EPA/OCE/IEMU 206-553-5317 | 4/8/10 |
| Jon Klemesrud | EPA/OCE/IEMU 206-553-5068 | |
| Cara Mckinnon | WA Dept of Ag 360-202-3257 | |
| Signature of Management Q A Reviewer | Agency/Office/Phone and Fax Numbers | Date |
| | | 06/24/10 |

EPA Form 3560-3 (Rev 1-06) Previous editions are obsolete.

PCS WAU000482

PCS, 4-8-2010

INSTRUCTIONS

## Section A: National Data System Coding *(i.e., PCS)*

**Column 1: Transaction Code:** Use N, C, or D for New, Change, or Delete. All inspections will be *new* unless there is an error in the data entered.

**Columns 3-11: NPDES Permit No.** Enter the facility's NPDES permit number - third character in permit number indicates permit type for U=unpermitted, G=general permit, etc.. *(Use the Remarks columns to record the State permit number, if necessary.)*

**Columns 12-17: Inspection Date.** Insert the date entry was made into the facility. Use the year/month/day format (e.g., 04/10/01 = October 01, 2004).

**Column 18: Inspection Type*.** Use one of the codes listed below to describe the type of inspection:

| | |
|---|---|
| A | Performance Audit |
| B | Compliance Biomonitoring |
| C | Compliance Evaluation (non-sampling) |
| D | Diagnostic |
| F | Pretreatment (Follow-up) |
| G | Pretreatment (Audit) |
| I | Industrial User (IU) Inspection |
| J | Complaints |
| M | Multimedia |
| N | Spill |
| O | Compliance Evaluation (Oversight) |
| P | Pretreatment Compliance Inspection |
| R | Reconnaissance |
| S | Compliance Sampling |
| U | IU Inspection with Pretreatment Audit |
| X | Toxics Inspection |
| Z | Sludge - Biosolids |
| # | Combined Sewer Overflow-Sampling |
| $ | Combined Sewer Overflow-Non-Sampling |
| + | Sanitary Sewer Overflow-Sampling |
| & | Sanitary Sewer Overflow-Non-Sampling |
| \ | CAFO-Sampling |
| = | CAFO-Non-Sampling |
| 2 | IU Sampling Inspection |
| 3 | IU Non-Sampling Inspection |
| 4 | IU Toxics Inspection |
| 5 | IU Sampling Inspection with Pretreatment |
| 6 | IU Non-Sampling Inspection with Pretreatment |
| 7 | IU Toxics with Pretreatment |
| ! | Pretreatment Compliance (Oversight) |
| @ | Follow-up (enforcement) |
| { | Storm Water-Construction-Sampling |
| } | Storm Water-Construction-Non-Sampling |
| : | Storm Water-Non-Construction-Sampling |
| ~ | Storm Water-Non-Construction-Non-Sampling |
| < | Storm Water-MS4-Sampling |
| - | Storm Water-MS4-Non-Sampling |
| > | Storm Water-MS4-Audit |

**Column 19: Inspector Code. Use one of the codes listed below to describe the *lead agency* in the inspection.**

| | |
|---|---|
| A — | State (Contractor) |
| B ---- | EPA (Contractor) |
| E — | Corps of Engineers |
| J — | Joint EPA/State Inspectors—EPA Lead |
| L ---- | Local Health Department (State) |
| N — | NEIC Inspectors |
| O— | Other Inspectors, Federal/EPA (Specify in Remarks columns) |
| P— | Other Inspectors, State (Specify in Remarks columns) |
| R — | EPA Regional Inspector |
| S — | State Inspector |
| T — | Joint State/EPA Inspectors—State lead |

**Column 20: Facility Type. Use one of the codes below to describe the facility.**

1 — Municipal. Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) with 1987 Standard Industrial Code (SIC) 4952.
2 — Industrial. Other than municipal, agricultural, and Federal facilities.
3 — Agricultural. Facilities classified with 1987 SIC 0111 to 0971.
4 — Federal. Facilities identified as Federal by the EPA Regional Office.
5 — Oil & Gas. Facilities classified with 1987 SIC 1311 to 1389.

**Columns 21-66: Remarks.** These columns are reserved for remarks at the discretion of the Region.

**Columns 67-69: Inspection Work Days.** Estimate the total work effort (to the nearest 0.1 work day), up to 99.9 days, that were used to complete the inspection and submit a QA reviewed report of findings. This estimate includes the accumulative effort of all participating inspectors; any effort for laboratory analyses, testing, and remote sensing; and the billed payroll time for travel and pre and post inspection preparation. This estimate does not require detailed documentation.

**Column 70: Facility Evaluation Rating.** Use information gathered during the inspection (regardless of inspection type) to evaluate the quality of the facility self-monitoring program. Grade the program using a scale of 1 to 5 with a score of 5 being used for very reliable self-monitoring programs, 3 being satisfactory, and 1 being used for very unreliable programs.

**Column 71: Biomonitoring Information.** Enter D for static testing. Enter F for flow through testing. Enter N for no biomonitoring.

**Column 72: Quality Assurance Data Inspection.** Enter Q if the inspection was conducted as followup on quality assurance sample results. Enter N otherwise.

**Columns 73-80:** These columns are reserved for regionally defined information.

## Section B: Facility Data

This section is self-explanatory except for "Other Facility Data," which may include new information not in the permit or PCS (e.g., new outfalls, names of receiving waters, new ownership, other updates to the record, SIC/NAICS Codes, Latitude/Longitude).

## Section C: Areas Evaluated During Inspection

Check only those areas evaluated by marking the appropriate box. Use Section D and additional sheets as necessary. Support the findings, as necessary, in a brief narrative report. Use the headings given on the report form (e.g., Permit, Records/Reports) when discussing the areas evaluated during the inspection.

## Section D: Summary of Findings/Comments

Briefly summarize the inspection findings. This summary should abstract the pertinent inspection findings, not replace the narrative report. Reference a list of attachments, such as completed checklists taken from the NPDES Compliance Inspection Manuals and pretreatment guidance documents, including effluent data when sampling has been done. Use extra sheets as necessary.

*Footnote: In addition to the inspection types listed above under column 18, a state may continue to use the following wet weather and CAFO inspection types until the state is brought into ICIS-NPDES: K: CAFO, V: SSO, Y: CSO, W: Storm Water 9: MS4. States may also use the new wet weather, CAFO and MS4 inspections types shown in column 18 of this form. The EPA regions are required to use the new wet weather, CAFO, and MS4 inspection types for inspections with an inspection date (DTIN) on or after July 1, 2005.

# NPDES
# Inspection Report

## Countryside Dairy, LLC

## Ferndale, Washington

**March 30, 2010**

**Prepared by:**
**Sandra Brozusky, Environmental Protection Specialist**
**Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10**
**Office of Compliance and Enforcement**
**Inspection and Enforcement Management Unit**

## Table of Contents


I. Facility Information

II. Inspection Information

III. Permit Information

IV. Background and Activity

V. Individuals Present

VI. Inspection Entry

VII. Inspection Chronology

VIII. Owner and Operator Information

IX. Number of Animals

X. Presence of Vegetation in the Confinement Areas

XI. Length of Animal Confinement

XII. Waste Management Process

XIII. Observed Discharge

XIV. Areas of Concern

XV. Receiving Water

XVI. Sample Collection and Analyses

Attachments

A. Photograph Documentation

(Unless otherwise noted, all details in this inspection report were obtained from conversations with Michael Schoneveld or from observations during the inspection.)

## I. Facility Information

| | |
|---|---|
| Facility Name: | Coutryside Dairy, LLC |
| Facility Type: | Dairy (SIC = 0241) |
| Facility Address: | 771 Parklyn Way<br>Ferndale, WA 98248<br>Whatcom County |
| Facility Phone #s: | (b) (6) (Business)<br>(b) (6) (Michael's Cell) |
| Facility Contact(s): | Michael Schoneveld (owner and operator) |

## II. Inspection Information

| | |
|---|---|
| Inspection Date: | March 30, 2010 |
| Arrival Time: | 1:35 PM |
| Departure Time: | 2:34 PM |
| Weather: | Sunny |
| Purpose: | Determination of compliance with the Clean Water Act. |

## III. Permit Information

This facility is currently unpermitted.

## IV. Background and Activity

The waste generated at this facility is mainly from the areas where animals are confined (the feeding area and the milking parlor). This waste includes manure and urine deposited in the confinement areas.

This facility has one main confinement area on the property, which includes three barns and a milking parlor.

The inspection of this dairy is part of EPA Region 10's concentrated animal feeding operation initiative.

## V. Individuals Present

The inspectors present for this inspection were Sandra Brozusky (EPA), Jon Klemesrud (EPA) and Cara McKinnon (Washington State Department of Agriculture).

The facility representative present during the inspection was Michael Schoneveld.

## VI. Inspection Entry

This was an unannounced inspection. We arrived at the facility at 1:35 PM on March 30, 2010 where we met Mr. Schoneveld. We presented our credentials and explained the purpose of our visit.

Mr. Schoneveld accompanied us throughout the inspection. He did not deny us access to the facility.

## VII. Inspection Chronology

We began the inspection with a brief opening conference in the parking lot area of the facility. During the opening conference, I explained the purpose of the visit.

After the opening conference, we proceeded to conduct a tour of the facility. The facility tour included an inspection of the barns, parlor and the waste storage lagoons. The tour also included an inspection of a nearby water body.

We ended the inspection with a brief exit interview where we thanked Mr. Schoneveld for his time.

## VIII. Owner and Operator Information

This dairy is owned and operated by Mr. Schoneveld.

## IX. Number of Animals

Mr. Schoneveld indicated that the property housed 780 milking cows and 100 dry cows at the time of inspection.

## X. Presence of Vegetation in the Confinement Areas

The barns at this facility (where the animals are fed and maintained) and the milking parlor had concrete floors. Based on my observation at the time of the inspection, the confinement barns and the milking parlor were devoid of vegetation.

## XI. Length of Animal Confinement

According to Mr. Schoneveld, the animals are confined year round.

## XII. Waste Management Process

The main confinement area has three barns, one milking parlor and two above ground storage lagoons. Waste from the barns is scraped directly into the two lagoons, located at the west side of the barns. Waste from the milking parlor will gravity flow through a pipe to one of the two lagoons. In addition, runoff from feed storage is routed to a below ground pit and then pumped into one of the two lagoons.

Mr. Schoneveld indicated that the facility has a total of approximately 700 acres to land apply waste. Waste is applied using injection or a manure truck spreader.

## XIII. Observed Discharge

At the time of this inspection, I did not see a discharge to nearby surface water.

## XIV. Areas of Concern

We inspected the facility including the confinement areas and the waste handling system. I did not see any areas of concern at the time of inspection.

## XV. Receiving Water

The closest receiving waters are Duffner Ditch and Bentrard Creek. According to Mr. Schoneveld these two waterways ultimately lead to the Nooksack River.

## XVI. Sample Collection and Analyses

I did not take samples at the time of inspection.

**Report Completion Date:** 6/24/10

**Lead Inspector Signature:** 

# ATTACHMENT A

**Photograph Documentation**
**Countryside Dairy, LLC**

All photographs were taken by Sandra Brozusky on March 30, 2010.


Photo #1: An overview of one of two above ground lagoons at the facility. Waste is directly scraped into the lagoons from the barns.

Photo #2: A view a feed storage area. The red arrows indicates the flow of runoff from this area into the below ground pit.


Photo #3: Looking in the opposite direction of the previous picture, this view is a continuation of the flow of runoff from a feed storage area. Also in this view is another feed storage area, where runoff will also be routed to the below ground pit. Waste in this pit is routed to one of the two lagoons. The red arrows indicate the flow of the runoff.